United Nations A/C.3/62/SR.42

General Assembly
Sixty-second session

Official Records

Distr.: General
28 January 2008
English
Original: French

Third Committee

Summary record of the 42nd meeting
Held at Headquarters, New York, on Friday, 9 November 2007, at 3 p.m.

Chairman: Mr. Wolfe (Jamaica)

Contents

Agenda item 69: Right of peoples to self-determination (*continued*)

Agenda item 70: Promotion and protection of human rights (*continued*)

(b) Human rights questions, including alternative approaches for improving the effective enjoyment of human rights and fundamental freedoms (*continued*)

(c) Human rights situations and reports of special rapporteurs and representatives (*continued*)

Agenda item 63: Advancement of women (*continued*)

Agenda item 70: Promotion and protection of human rights (*continued*)

(f) Commemoration of the sixtieth anniversary of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights (*continued*)

This record is subject to correction. Corrections should be sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned *within one week of the date of publication* to the Chief of the Official Records Editing Section, room DC2-750, 2 United Nations Plaza, and incorporated in a copy of the record.

Corrections will be issued after the end of the session, in a separate corrigendum for each Committee.

07-59056 (E)

The meeting was called to order at 3.15 p.m.

Agenda item 69: Right of peoples to self-determination (*continued*) (A/C.3/62/L.56)

Draft resolution A/C.3/62/L.56: Universal realization of the right of peoples to self-determination

1. **Mr. Amil** (Pakistan), introducing draft resolution A/C.3/62/L.56 on behalf of its sponsors, recalled that the right to self-determination was enshrined in the Charter of the United Nations and the two International Covenants on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights and on Civil and Political Rights, and had been reaffirmed at major conferences and United Nations summits. International law accorded it great centrality as the sine qua non for the enjoyment of all other rights. It had enabled millions of people suppressed by racist regimes, colonialism, apartheid, foreign occupation and alien domination to achieve equality before the law, in society and in politics.

2. He hoped that the draft resolution on the right to self-determination would again be adopted by consensus, as had traditionally been the case.

3. **Mr. Khane** (Secretary of the Committee) announced that Burkina Faso and Thailand wished to join the sponsors of the draft resolution.

Agenda item 70: Promotion and protection of human rights (*continued*)

(b) Human rights questions, including alternative approaches for improving the effective enjoyment of human rights and fundamental freedoms (*continued*) (A/C.3/62/L.31, L.39, L.40, L.45, L.46, L.47, L.48, L.49, L.50, L.52, L.53, L.54 and L.55)

Draft resolution A/C.3/62/L.31: Globalization and its impact on the full enjoyment of all human rights

4. **Mr. Attiya** (Egypt), introducing draft resolution A/C.3/62/L.31 on behalf of its sponsors, said that Azerbaijan and Mauritania wished to join the sponsors and that the increasing number of sponsors demonstrated the degree of importance attached to examining the effects of globalization on humanity. It was by no means an attempt either to prejudge the course of globalization or to pass value judgements on that phenomenon, but merely an attempt to grasp changes in modes of communication, production and technology in all their complexity, find a way of optimizing the exercise of all human rights and help the international community to better exploit possibilities and face challenges that might arise.

5. He believed that it was possible to narrow and even bridge the fault lines in perceptions of the human rights aspects of globalization, and expressed the hope that the international community would achieve greater understanding of globalization and greater cooperation in averting its negative effects.

6. **Mr. Khane** (Secretary of the Committee) announced that Afghanistan, Cape Verde, the Central African Republic, Suriname and Tunisia wished to join the sponsors of the draft resolution.

Draft resolution A/C.3/62/L.40: Protection of migrants

7. **Mr. Ochoa** (Mexico), introducing draft resolution A/C.3/62/L.40, said that Argentina, Armenia, Brazil, Costa Rica, Ecuador, El Salvador, Ghana, Nicaragua, Sri Lanka and Uruguay wished to join the sponsors. He hoped that the draft would be adopted by consensus as in previous years.

8. **Mr. Khane** (Secretary of the Committee) announced that Algeria, Angola, Azerbaijan, Belize, Benin, Cape Verde, Chile, Guinea, Haiti, Kyrgyzstan, Mauritania, Morocco, Niger, Nigeria, Paraguay and Senegal wished to join the sponsors of the draft resolution.

Draft resolution A/C.3/62/L.45: Human rights in the administration of justice

9. **Ms. Nguyen** (Austria), introducing draft resolution A/C.3/62/L.45, said that Andorra, Azerbaijan, Belarus, Denmark, France, Japan, Jordan, Mali, Switzerland, Ukraine and Uruguay wished to join the sponsors. Out of its belief that an independent and impartial judiciary and access to justice were prerequisites for the rule of law and the protection of human rights, her country had introduced draft resolutions on that topic to the Third Committee and the Commission on Human Rights every two years; the last of those drafts had been adopted by consensus.

10. The draft resolution under consideration took into account the fact that the question of human rights in the administration of justice was under consideration in the Human Rights Council. The text was therefore

mainly procedural. Its new elements were in the areas of juvenile justice and women in prison.

11. A comprehensive debate was scheduled for 2008 on the report submitted by the Secretary-General to the Human Rights Council at its fourth session in May 2007, on the basis of which the General Assembly would revert to substantive consideration of that issue. For the sake of avoiding duplications, her delegation proposed that new reporting obligations of the Secretary-General to the General Assembly should not be created. She hoped that the draft would be adopted without a vote.

12. **Mr. Khane** (Secretary of the Committee) announced that Albania, Benin, Cape Verde, Costa Rica, El Salvador, Montenegro, Morocco, Paraguay, the Republic of Korea, Serbia and the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia wished to join the sponsors of the draft resolution.

Draft resolution A/C.3/62/L.46: Effective promotion of the Declaration on the Rights of Persons Belonging to National or Ethnic, Religious and Linguistic Minorities

13. **Ms. Schöfer** (Austria), introducing draft resolution A/C.3/62/L.46, said that Australia, Belarus, Canada, the Czech Republic, Denmark, El Salvador, Greece, Iceland, Italy, Latvia, Lithuania, Panama, Romania, the Russian Federation, San Marino, Spain, Ukraine and Uruguay wished to join the sponsors. Meeting the aspirations of persons belonging to minorities, which contributed to political and social stability and peace and enriched the cultural diversity and heritage of a society, could only be achieved through the promotion of tolerance, mutual understanding and pluralism.

14. Austria had traditionally introduced draft resolutions on the rights of minorities to the Third Committee, the Commission on Human Rights and, more recently, the Human Rights Council.

15. The Human Rights Council was currently considering the question of minorities and, in particular, had adopted a resolution creating a Forum on Minority Issues, which would replace the Working Group on Minorities. At its annual session in 2008, it would review the mandate of the independent expert on minority issues. It was therefore proposed, in the short procedural resolution under consideration, that the General Assembly, taking into account those activities, should resume substantive consideration of the question of minorities at its sixty-third session. She hoped that the draft would, as at the sixtieth session, be adopted without a vote.

16. **Mr. Khane** (Secretary of the Committee) announced that Benin, Cape Verde, the Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, Guatemala, Mauritius, Montenegro, the Republic of Korea, Serbia and the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia wished to join the sponsors of the draft resolution.

Draft resolution A/C.3/62/L.47: Protection of human rights and fundamental freedoms while countering terrorism

17. **Ms. Feller** (Mexico), introducing draft resolution A/C.3/62/L.47, said that Monaco and Uruguay had become sponsors. She reaffirmed that terrorism represented a serious problem for the territorial integrity and security of States but that the need for States to protect their population, particularly from terrorist acts, in no way justified suspension of the rights of persons under their jurisdiction. In addition to being reprehensible, measures that undermined human rights were counterproductive because they detracted from the goal, which was to ensure people's safety.

18. The draft resolution reaffirmed the need for counter-terrorism measures to be compatible with international law and had been updated to take into account persistent problems in that area. She hoped that, following informal consultations being held, it would be adopted by consensus.

19. **Mr. Khane** (Secretary of the Committee) announced that Angola, Armenia, Benin, Chile, Côte d'Ivoire, the Dominican Republic, El Salvador, Morocco, Panama, Paraguay and Senegal had joined the sponsors of the draft resolution.

Draft resolution A/C.3/62/L.48: Enhancement of international cooperation in the field of human rights

20. **Mr. Amorós Núñez** (Cuba), speaking on behalf of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries to introduce the draft resolution, expressed the hope that the text, which encouraged international cooperation and dialogue for the promotion, protection and full realization of all human rights, would be adopted by consensus.

Draft resolution A/C.3/62/L.49: The right to development

21. **Mr. Amorós Núñez** (Cuba), speaking on behalf of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries to introduce the draft resolution, said that the text was extremely important to the Movement because its aim was to ensure the implementation of the 1986 Declaration on the Right to Development and of the Declaration and Programme of Action adopted in 1993 and to support the activities of the Human Rights Council and the General Assembly. It was necessary to consider the drafting of a convention or a legally binding instrument on the right to development, which should be on par with the other human rights and fundamental freedoms. He expressed the hope that the text would be adopted by consensus or at least with broad support.

22. **Mr. Khane** (Secretary of the Committee) announced that China, El Salvador and the Philippines had joined the sponsors of the draft resolution.

Draft resolution A/C.3/62/L.50: Human rights and unilateral coercive measures

23. **Mr. Amorós Núñez** (Cuba), speaking on behalf of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries to introduce the draft resolution, noted with concern that, despite the recommendations made in particular by the General Assembly, the Human Rights Council and its predecessor the Commission on Human Rights, unilateral coercive measures that were contrary to international law and to the Charter and that had serious socio-economic consequences in the developing countries continued to be adopted and applied, and urged all countries to refrain from using them. He expressed the hope that the draft resolution would be approved by the majority of countries.

24. **Mr. Khane** (Secretary of the Committee) announced that China had become a sponsor of the draft resolution.

Draft resolution A/C.3/62/L.52: Promotion of peace as a vital requirement for the full enjoyment of all human rights by all

25. **Ms. González Navarro** (Cuba), introducing the draft resolution, said that Bangladesh, Indonesia, Kenya, the Russian Federation, Tunisia and Turkmenistan had become sponsors. She hoped that the draft resolution, which emphasized that all peoples had a sacred right to peace and that the preservation and promotion of peace constituted a fundamental obligation of each State, would receive the support of all Member States.

26. **Mr. Khane** (Secretary of the Committee) announced that the Central African Republic had joined the sponsors of the draft resolution.

Draft resolution A/C.3/62/L.53: The right to food

27. **Ms. Pérez Álvarez** (Cuba) introduced the draft resolution on behalf of its sponsors, which had been joined by: Azerbaijan, the Bahamas, Botswana, the Democratic Republic of the Congo, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Lebanon, the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Malawi, Qatar, the Russian Federation, Sierra Leone, South Africa, the Sudan and Zambia. She said that the right to food was widely recognized in the international instruments and declarations on human rights but that hunger and food insecurity remained a worldwide problem, which was particularly acute in the developing countries and especially in Africa, where the situation was deteriorating.

28. Hunger was an affront to human dignity, which States must combat by adopting without delay political, economic and social measures at the national, regional and international levels and particularly by making use of all available technical and financial resources. The Secretary-General and the High Commissioner for Human Rights should continue to provide the Special Rapporteur on the right to food with the necessary human and financial resources for the fulfilment of his mandate and Governments, relevant United Nations agencies, funds and programmes, treaty bodies and non-governmental organizations should cooperate with the Rapporteur. Member States which had not yet done so should become sponsors of the draft resolution in order to reaffirm their commitment to the right of everyone to healthy and sufficient food.

29. **Mr. Khane** (Secretary of the Committee) announced that Algeria, Antigua and Barbuda, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Cameroon, Cape Verde, the Central African Republic, Chad, China, the Comoros, the Congo, Costa Rica, Croatia, Djibouti, the Gambia, Haiti, Lesotho, Liberia, Madagascar, Mauritania, Mauritius, Namibia, Norway, Oman, the Philippines, Suriname, Turkey, Turkmenistan and the United Republic of Tanzania had joined the sponsors of the draft resolution.

30. He also announced that Cuba should of course be added to the list of sponsors of draft resolution A/C.3/62/L.53.

Draft resolution A/C.3/62/L.54: Strengthening United Nations action in the field of human rights through the promotion of international cooperation and the importance of non-selectivity, impartiality and objectivity

31. **Mr. Ferrer Arenas** (Cuba) introduced the draft resolution on behalf of the sponsors, which had been joined by Burkina Faso, Ghana, Guinea-Bissau, the Lao People's Democratic Republic, Malawi, Myanmar, Namibia, Qatar, the Russian Federation, South Africa, the Sudan, Suriname and Turkmenistan. The United Nations must promote respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms through international cooperation, which was bound up with the principles of non-selectivity, impartiality and objectivity. For that reason, due account should be taken of the political, economic, social, historical and cultural specificities of each country, in accordance with the provisions of the Charter of the United Nations. He hoped that the draft resolution, which was designed to ensure that international cooperation made an effective and practical contribution to the prevention of mass and flagrant violations of human rights and fundamental freedoms and to the strengthening of international peace and security, would be adopted by consensus, as its predecessors had been.

32. **Mr. Khane** (Secretary of the Committee) announced that Cape Verde, the Central African Republic, Côte d'Ivoire, the Dominican Republic, Liberia, Mali, Mauritania, Mauritius, Sierra Leone, Tunisia and Uganda had joined the sponsors of the draft resolution.

Draft resolution A/C.3/62/L.55: Respect for the purposes and principles contained in the Charter of the United Nations to achieve international cooperation in promoting and encouraging respect for human rights and for fundamental freedoms and in solving international problems of a humanitarian character

33. **Mr. Ferrer Arenas** (Cuba) introduced the draft resolution on behalf of the sponsors, which had been joined by Burkina Faso, the Lao People's Democratic Republic, Malawi, the Sudan and Suriname, and recalled that Member States had undertaken to respect and promote the fundamental principles of international law embodied in the Charter of the United Nations. They were thus required to contribute regularly to the humanitarian activities conducted by the international community to promote the strengthening of cooperation among countries in that area and also of understanding, trust, tolerance and mutual respect geared to a fairer and non-violent world. Cuba, which was a strong advocate of multilateralism, urged all Member States to cooperate constructively to promote and protect human rights and encourage the peaceful settlement of international problems of a humanitarian nature, respecting the provisions of international law and particularly of international human rights law and international humanitarian law. He invited all delegations to vote in favour of the draft resolution.

34. **Mr. Khane** (Secretary of the Committee) announced that the Central African Republic had joined the sponsors of the draft resolution.

Draft resolution A/C.3/62/L.39: Human rights and cultural diversity

35. **Mr. Khani Jooyabad** (Islamic Republic of Iran), introducing the draft resolution, said that Bangladesh, Benin, Colombia, the Democratic Republic of the Congo, Jordan, Myanmar, Qatar and the Syrian Arab Republic had joined in sponsoring the draft resolution. He emphasized that intercultural dialogue had important benefits and enriched the common understanding of human rights, and that those rights were universal, indivisible, interdependent and interrelated.

36. Some revisions had been made to the draft resolution. The ninth preambular paragraph now read "*Taking note* of the Non-Aligned Movement Ministerial Meeting on Human Rights and Cultural Diversity, held in Tehran on 3 and 4 September 2007". The fourteenth, seventeenth and twentieth preambular paragraphs had been deleted. Lastly, paragraph 14 now read "*Stresses* the necessity of freely using the media and new information and communication technologies to create the conditions for renewed dialogue among cultures and civilizations".

37. He expressed the hope that the draft resolution would be adopted without a vote.

38. **Mr. Khane** (Secretary of the Committee) announced that Cameroon, Cape Verde, the Comoros, the Gambia, Iraq, Mali, Mauritania, Nigeria, South

Africa and Tunisia had joined the sponsors of the draft resolution.

(c) Human rights situations and reports of special rapporteurs and representatives (*continued*) (A/C.3/62/L.37, L.41, L.43 and L.51)

Draft resolution A/C.3/62/L.37: Situation of human rights in the Democratic People's Republic of Korea

39. **Mr. Khane** (Secretary of the Committee) said that in paragraph 1 (b) of the draft resolution the word "continuing" should be inserted before "reports". Furthermore, paragraph 3 should be amended to read: "While noting the prompt reaction of the Government of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea to the latest floods, and the openness shown in seeking outside assistance, expresses its very deep concern at the precarious humanitarian situation in the country, compounded by the misallocation of resources away from the satisfaction of basic needs and by frequent natural disasters, in particular the prevalence of maternal and infant malnutrition, which, despite recent progress, continues to affect the physical and mental development of a significant proportion of children, and urges the Government of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, in this regard, to take preventive and remedial action, to facilitate access to humanitarian aid and to take measures to allow humanitarian agencies to secure its impartial delivery to all parts of the country on the basis of need in accordance with humanitarian principles, and to ensure food security, including through sustainable agriculture".

40. **Mr. Lobo de Mesquito** (Portugal), introducing the draft resolution on behalf of the European Union and the other sponsors, which had been joined by Andorra, Iceland, Moldova and Serbia, said that the Democratic People's Republic of Korea had made progress in the last year, but much remained to be done.

41. The General Assembly, confronted with the human rights situation in the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, should not remain silent. He urged all Member States to give the draft resolution the broadest possible support.

Draft resolution A/C.3/62/L.41: Situation of human rights in Myanmar

42. **Mr. Lobo de Mesquito** (Portugal), introducing the draft resolution on behalf of the European Union and the other sponsors, which had been joined by Bosnia and Herzegovina and Moldova, said that the situation in Myanmar remained a source of deep concern, despite the positive steps that had been taken, especially with regard to the visit to that country by the Special Rapporteur. With a view to having the text adopted by consensus, the sponsors of the draft resolution had engaged in negotiations with the delegation of Myanmar which had seemed to be constructive until Myanmar had decided that a consensus could not be achieved, despite the amendments which the sponsors had been ready to make. The sponsors remained open to further consultations.

Draft resolution A/C.3/62/L.43: Situation of human rights in the Islamic Republic of Iran

43. **Mr. Khane** (Secretary of the Committee) drew attention to a number of changes in the English text of the draft resolution: in paragraph 2 (b) the word "of" before "other" had been deleted; in paragraph 2 (f), the words "and prevention of the Bahai faith" had been replaced by "and preventing members of the Bahai faith and", the word "and" had been inserted before "an increase in paces".

44. **Mr. Normandin** (Canada), introducing the draft resolution on behalf of the sponsors, which had been joined by Iceland, drew attention to paragraph 2 (c), where the words "sentences of stoning" had been replaced by "sentences to execution by stoning". In addition paragraph 3 (e) had been revised to read: "To eliminate, in law and in practice, all forms of discrimination and other human rights violations against women and girls". In paragraph 4, the words "thematic procedures" should be replaced by "special thematic procedures".

45. It was regrettable that the Government of the Islamic Republic of Iran had not addressed the concerns expressed by the General Assembly in the resolution on the situation of human rights in that country adopted at its sixty-first session. That situation continued to deteriorate because the authorities resorted to torture and other cruel, inhuman or degrading treatment, such as execution by stoning, to

the violent repression of the activities of defenders of women's human rights, and to discrimination against minorities.

46. The draft resolution had been carefully drafted to ensure accuracy and to reflect the current situation in the country. Member States had pledged to promote universal respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms which the Government of the Islamic Republic of Iran continued to deny its citizens. He called on all Member States to vote in favour of the draft resolution.

47. **Mr. Khane** (Secretary of the Committee) announced that Fiji had joined the sponsors of the draft resolution.

Draft resolution A/C.3/62/L.51: Situation of human rights in Belarus

48. **Mr. Rees** (United States of America), introducing the draft resolution on behalf of the sponsors, said that although a resolution on Belarus had been adopted by the Third Committee in 2004 and 2006 and by the Commission on Human Rights three times in recent years, the situation of human rights in Belarus had continued to deteriorate. The departure of the Special Rapporteur on the situation of human rights in Belarus from the Human Rights Council in the summer of 2007 made it even more imperative for the Council to examine closely the serious human rights violations occurring in Belarus and to reaffirm its strong concern about them. Referring to the third, fifth and sixth preambular paragraphs, he said that intimidation of political opponents had increased, press freedom had been curtailed and the rights to freedom of speech, assembly and association had been violated. The harassment, detention and jailing of young people were particularly troubling. Regrettably, the Government of Belarus had not responded to repeated calls by the General Assembly or to the recommendations of the Office for Democratic Institutions and Human Rights of the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe for democratic governance and reform of its human rights practices. The United Nations must respond to Belarus's failure to comply with its international obligations and its continued repression and intimidation of its people. Adoption of the draft resolution would give hope to the people of Belarus and would signify to the Government that the human rights of its citizens must be respected. Failure to adopt the draft resolution would ensure the Government's impunity and would be a terrible blow to the people. He therefore urged delegations to support the draft resolution and to consider joining the sponsors.

49. **Mr. Tegos** (Greece), speaking on a point of order, said that the representative of the United States had referred to the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia as the Republic of Macedonia and recalled that, pursuant to General Assembly resolution 47/225, the country should be referred to as the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia.

50. **The Chairman** reminded delegations that all States should be referred to by their official name.

Agenda item 63: Advancement of women (*continued*) (A/C.3/62/L.16/Rev.1)

Draft resolution A/C.3/62/L.16/Rev.1: Eliminating rape and other forms of sexual violence in all their manifestations, including as instruments to achieve political or military objectives

51. **Mr. Rees** (United States of America) said that Costa Rica and Haiti had joined in sponsoring the draft resolution.

52. **The Chairman** said that action on draft resolution A/C.3/62/L.16/Rev.1 would be deferred.

Agenda item 70: Promotion and protection of human rights (*continued*)

(f) Commemoration of the sixtieth anniversary of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights (*continued*) (A/C.3/62/L.28/Rev.1)

Draft resolution A/C.3/62/L.28/Rev.1: International Year of Human Rights Learning

53. **The Chairman** said that the draft resolution had no programme budget implications.

54. **Mr. Babadoudou** (Benin) said that Austria, Barbados, Belize, Brazil, Bulgaria, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, El Salvador, Guatemala, Guyana, Haiti, Italy, Jordan, Lebanon, Qatar, Slovenia and Thailand had joined in sponsoring the draft resolution. He read out the revisions that had been made to the text. A new subparagraph had been added after the fourth preambular paragraph which read: "Noting the complementarity between the World Programme for Human Rights Education and the International Year of Human Rights Learning,". Paragraph 4 had been reworded to read: "Decides to commemorate the

sixtieth anniversary of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights in a plenary meeting on 10 December 2008 and invites Member States to participate in it at the highest level." In paragraph 5 the words "the end of the year during" had been inserted before the phrase "its sixty-fourth session". He believed that the draft resolution would help to accelerate the realization of human rights and fundamental freedoms and hoped that it would be adopted by consensus.

55. **Mr. Khane** (Secretary of the Committee) announced that Armenia, Croatia, the Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Honduras, Kazakhstan, Nicaragua, Panama, Suriname and Turkey had joined in sponsoring the draft resolution as orally revised.

56. *Draft resolution A/C.3/62/L.28/Rev.1 was adopted.*

Statements in exercise of the right of reply

57. **Mr. Dapkiunas** (Belarus) thanked the delegation that had, for the third time in three years, decided to submit a draft resolution on the situation of human rights in Belarus (A/C.3/62/L.51). Even though the tradition was an unfortunate one, the sponsors of the draft resolution had been innovative by submitting a draft of the text to his delegation before submitting it to the Committee secretariat, and the main sponsor had announced that consultations would be held on it, although they had actually not been held.

58. Belarus was much more appreciative of the progress made in institution-building within the Human Rights Council. That progress led one to hope that consideration of the human rights situation in individual countries might be carried out in a fair, non-selective and impartial manner.

59. Associating himself with the remarks made by the representative of Singapore, he regretted that the Third Committee had become a self-righteous body committed to recrimination and unwilling to tolerate any dissent. Many delegations felt that the parallel consideration of human rights questions by the Third Committee and the Council could be complementary, but that was not the case: it was selective and partial. Some delegations said they wanted to reply to the reports on Belarus prepared by NGOs, but those reports were no worse than those that Amnesty International prepared on the countries that set themselves up as judges. A more constructive and responsible way of sharing such concerns would thus have to be found. Belarus was interested in any kind of assistance and guidance that would enable it to improve the living conditions of its population, but it could not accept threats, intimidation or arrogance.

60. He wondered whether the sponsors of the draft resolution truly believed that a vote in the General Assembly would make it possible to consider the sensitive question of the promotion of human rights properly. A vote did not settle disputes or bring parties together. It was merely a means of legitimizing a split. Remedies were to be found first and foremost in the Charter of the United Nations: engagement and cooperation. If the sponsors of the draft resolution were as strong and virtuous as they believed themselves to be, they might consider withdrawing their text. If not, they could at least consider that the no-action motion on the draft did not reflect a lack of respect for their concerns but was in fact a positive sign. Such a motion should only be adopted as a last resort, and if it was adopted, it did not represent any kind of victory. Victory lay in compromise and dialogue.

61. **Mr. Tin** (Myanmar) said it was deplorable that once again the European Union had failed to circulate the text of draft resolution A/C.3/62/L.41, on the situation of human rights in Myanmar, to his delegation sufficiently in advance to have made a consensus possible. If the European Union really wanted to achieve consensus, it should not have submitted a text that ran counter to the objective it sought. The text was unfortunate and even harsher than the one submitted the previous year, and it would in no way contribute to the success of the Secretary-General's good offices mission. He deeply regretted that the draft text, which targeted a particular country, contained elements relating to matters that were solely within Myanmar's national jurisdiction rather than focusing on matters that could have promoted cooperation. The draft text was dominated by recent events in Myanmar. However, during his visit to Myanmar from 3 to 8 November 2007, the Special Adviser to the Secretary-General, Mr. Gambari, had observed that progress had been made. The Special Adviser had met with the Prime Minister, representatives of the monks and ethnic groups, and with Aung San Suu Kyi, who had authorized him to make a statement on her behalf in which she had confirmed that she had had a constructive exchange of views with the Liaison Minister, Mr. Aung Kyi, and had met with senior members of the National League for Democracy, and

had said that she was prepared to cooperate with the Government so that a dialogue could be maintained. Cooperation with the United Nations was the cornerstone of Myanmar's foreign policy. He drew attention to a press release that the Organization had issued concerning the Special Adviser's visit to Myanmar and reaffirmed his country's continued willingness to cooperate with the good offices mission. In conclusion, he said that the draft resolution utterly failed to take into account the improvement that had been observed in the situation in Myanmar.

62. **Mr. Pak** Tok Hun (Democratic People's Republic of Korea) said that his delegation rejected draft resolution A/C.3/62/L.37, on the situation of human rights in the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, which had been submitted by the European Union. The text reflected the politicization of human rights, selectivity and a double standard that ran counter to the will of most Member States. The draft was the product of a political plot by the hostile forces of the European Union and the United States of America, which sought to paralyse the Democratic People's Republic of Korea. The goal of the sponsors was to undermine the social system of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea on the pretext of protecting human rights by distorting the human rights situation in that country. Yet the most serious violations in the world at present were the massacres of innocent persons in Iraq, Afghanistan and the Occupied Palestinian Territory that were being carried out in the name of combating terrorism. He wondered how the sponsors of the draft resolution could speak of human rights when they had no compunction about violating the right to survival by invading and occupying sovereign States. The European Union should attend to its own affairs and eliminate such contemporary forms of racism as racial discrimination, xenophobia and ill-treatment of minorities within its member States. By submitting draft resolutions that targeted developing countries exclusively, the West only stirred up antagonism and defiance in the parties concerned. The draft resolution in question was a web of lies invented by hostile forces, including Japan and the United States of America, which devoted billions of dollars each year to propaganda and other activities directed against the Democratic People's Republic of Korea. For a number of years the European Union had been responsible for thwarting any prospect of cooperation with the Democratic People's Republic of Korea in the field of human rights by submitting the draft resolution in the Third Committee. His delegation once again rejected the text and would continue to oppose any other politicized draft resolution that targeted a specific developing country.

63. **Mr. Rezvani** (Islamic Republic of Iran) said that draft resolution A/C.3/62/L.43, on the situation of human rights in the Islamic Republic of Iran, contained conceptual and procedural gaps and presented substantive problems. He recalled that five years previously a simple court case that had evolved into a bilateral dispute had led Canada to submit a draft resolution on the Islamic Republic of Iran in the Third Committee, which it had used as a medium for transmitting its message to the international community. His delegation, recognizing the competence of the recently established Human Rights Council, believed that such an action was a blatant misuse of the Committee's time and programme of work. Looking beyond the question of the legitimacy of submitting a politicized draft resolution, he wondered why the Canadian delegation had chosen to submit the text to the General Assembly when the Member States had collectively given the Human Rights Council the important task of the international protection and promotion of human rights. On the conceptual plane and citing the fourth preambular paragraph and paragraph 3 by way of example, his delegation noted that many provisions of the draft resolution were entirely divorced from reality and that the text was simply a list of unfounded allegations. He recalled that the Islamic Republic of Iran had experienced a much higher than average number of visits from rapporteurs responsible for the thematic special procedures of the former Commission on Human Rights. It was a pity that the Canadian delegation had nothing new to submit to the Third Committee.

The meeting rose at 5.30 p.m.